



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/582,969 | 07/07/2000 | PETER MORITZ | P00.1252 | 4636 |

7590 08/05/2004

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 300
McLean, VA 22102

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

LIN, WEN TAI

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/582,969

Applicant(s)

MORITZ, PETER

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-17 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 12-25 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 12-16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Low et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6246758].
4. As to claims 12-13, Low teaches the invention as claimed including: a method for offering telecommunication service in an intelligent network comprised of a service logic[Abstract; Fig.6], the method comprising:

implementing a first part of the service logic within a service control point [col.3, lines 17-36]; and implementing a second part of the service logic outside the service control point, wherein the second part of the service logic is implemented in the telecommunication terminal equipment of a service user [col.12, lines 45-49; i.e., the system not only has a conventional service logic, which runs within a SCP, it also

Art Unit: 2154

provides downloadable service logic to be executed at an accessing entity such as user A's terminal (e.g., col.26, lines 52-55)].

5. As to claims 14-16, Low further teaches that a connection exists between the first part of the service logic and the second part of the service logic, wherein the connection between the first part of the service logic and the second part of the service logic uses an existing connection of the telecommunication terminal equipment with the service control point [col.22, lines 46-54] and at least a part of the connection of the first part of the service logic and the second part of the service logic utilizes an ISDN connection [col.2, lines 15-26].

6. As to claim 22, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 12-16, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 12-16 above.

7. Claims 12-16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schumacher et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 5841854].

8. As to claims 12-13, Schumacher teaches the invention as claimed including: a method for offering telecommunication service in an intelligent network comprised of a service logic[Abstract; Fig.4], the method comprising:

implementing a first part of the service logic within a service control point [485, Fig.4]; and implementing a second part of the service logic outside the service control

Art Unit: 2154

point, wherein the second part of the service logic is implemented in the telecommunication terminal equipment [90, Fig.4] of a service user [col.15, lines 27 – 56; e.g., some service logic components may reside on SCP and some may reside on the PCS, which is a customer premise terminal].

9. As to claims 14-16, Schumacher further teaches that a connection exists between the first part of the service logic and the second part of the service logic, wherein the connection between the first part of the service logic and the second part of the service logic uses an existing connection of the telecommunication terminal equipment with the service control point [495, Fig.4] and at least a part of the connection of the first part of the service logic and the second part of the service logic utilizes an ISDN connection [col.9, lines 45-52].

10. As to claim 22, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 12-16, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 12-16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. Claims 17 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schumacher et al.(hereafter "Schumacher")[U.S. Pat. No. 5841854], as applied to claims 12-16 and 22 above.

12. As to claim 17, Schumacher does not specifically teach that charge information is at least partly generated by the second part of the service logic.

However, since the charge information is related to the call connection time/duration, which is essentially determined by the calling or called terminals, it is obvious that the charge information of Schumacher's system could have been generated by the second part of the service logic, because the second part of the service logic is in a better position of obtaining the connection information in a mobile environment.

13. As to claims 23-24, Schumacher teaches storing a portion of the service logic components in a customer premise PCS platform (which by itself is a terminal equipment) and communicate with the service logic at the SCP (Figs. 1 and 4).

Schumacher does not specifically teach using an API or JTAPI to provide an interface for the exchange of IN messages between the first part of the service logic stored on the terminal equipment and the second part of the service logic stored in the central part of the intelligent network.

However, it is well known in the art that API or JTAPI are popular techniques for providing interfaces among distributed processes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply API or JTAPI in Schumacher's system these are proven techniques in a distributed server-client environment and by doing so it would enhance the efficiency of Schumacher's system.

14. As to claim 25, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 12-16 and 22-23, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 12-16 and 22-23 above.

15. Claims 18-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Teper et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5815665]; and
Meubus et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6185565].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

Art Unit: 2154

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

July 30, 2004

Wen-Tai Lin
7/30/04